



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/729,240

12/05/2000

Krishna Bharat

0026-0001

4725

44989

7590

11/01/2006

HARRITY SNYDER, LLP  
11350 Random Hills Road  
SUITE 600  
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/729,240	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BHARAT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Tony Mahmoudi	<b>Art Unit</b> 2165	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-8,10-15,17-20,22,24,25,27,29-32 and 34-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4,9,16,21,23,26,28 and 33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Remarks***

1. In view of the communications filed on 07-October-2005, Claims 1-41 are presently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 25, 30, and 36 are presented in independent form.
2. The Examiner has thoroughly reviewed the claims and the disclosure of the instant Application (specification, drawings, etc.), in preparation for submitting an Examiner's Answer to the Board of Appeals and Interferences, as requested by the Appellant in the Appeal Brief filed on 07-October-2005. As a result of the latest review, the Examiner has identified some issues with the claims, which are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. The Examiner's new findings are presented in this Non-Final Office Action in order to help place the claims of the instant Application in a better condition for Appeal.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Independent claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 25, 30 and 36 (and their dependent claims) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 2165

The independent claims referenced above produce results that are not considered tangible.

Claims 1, 11, and 25 result in "selecting semantic units";

Claims 6, 30, and 36 result in "refining the generated list"; and

Claim 18 results in "locating semantic units".

The claims do not indicate what is done with the generated results (communicated to a user [e.g., displayed, printed, outputted, etc.], and they do not indicate if the generated results [or an indication thereof], is stored anywhere in memory.) It appears that the produced results of the independent claims of the instant Application are transparent to the user and/or to other systems. Therefore, the produced results are not considered "tangible".

Corrections are required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10-15, 17-20, 22, 24-25, 27, 29-32, and 34-41 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson et al (U.S. patent No. 6,216,123) in view of Emens et al (U.S. patent No. 6,295,559.)

As to claim 1, Robertson et al teaches a method (see Abstract) of identifying semantic units (see column 2, lines 58-63 and see column 18, lines 19-28) within a search query (see Abstract, and see column 18, lines 19-20, where a “search query” is read on “search operation”) comprising:

identifying documents relating to the query (see column 3, lines 15-24) by comparing search terms in the query (see column 14, lines 9-24, where “comparing” is read on “documents that match a search request”) to an index of a corpus (see column 10, lines 47-56 and see column 20, lines 21-30);

generating a plurality of multiword substrings from the query (see column 4, line 63 through column 5, line 5, see column 8, lines 12-23) in which each of the substrings includes at least two words (see column 2, lines 52-56 and see column 13, lines 15-21); and

calculating, for each of the generated substrings, a value that corresponds to a comparison between one or more of the identified documents and the generated substrings (see column 14, lines 9-64, where “calculating the value that corresponds to a comparison” is read on “calculates relevance information”, and see column 16, line 50 through column 17, line 8.)

Robertson et al does not teach: selecting semantic units from the generated multiword substrings based on the calculated values [although Robertson et al teaches “semantic units” as “a cluster of word numbers (see column 4, line 67 through column 5, line 5, and see column 18, lines 19-22), where each word number represents (is converted from) a word in a document (see column 2, lines 64-67.)]

Emens et al teaches a method for rating hypermedia for objectionable content (see Abstract), in which he teaches selecting semantic units from the generated multiword

Art Unit: 2165

substrings based on the calculated values (see column 5, lines 28-48, and see column 6, line 54 through column 7, line 5, where “calculated values” is read on “ratings”).)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Robertson et al to include selecting semantic units from the generated multiword substrings based on the calculated values.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Robertson et al by the teachings of Emens et al, because including selecting semantic units from the generated multiword substrings based on the calculated values, would enable the user to rank semantic units based on their relevance with the queried documents, and only retrieve (or only avoid) the documents (search results) that have a higher relevance or occurrence with the selected semantic units. In Emens et al, this limitation is used to filter out objectionable or unwanted content from documents before they are displayed to the user (see column 6, lines 57-66.) Other advantages of this limitation are explained in the Objections and Advantages and Summary sections of Emens et a (see column 2, lines 22-58.)

As to claims 3, 8, 15, 22, 27, and 32, Robertson et al as modified, teaches wherein the selection of the semantic units further includes:

selecting semantic units from the generated substrings that have calculated values above a predetermined threshold (see Robertson et al, column 5, lines 22-27, and see column 20, lines 44-67.)

Art Unit: 2165

As to claims 5, 10, 17, 24, 29, and 34, Robertson et al as modified teaches wherein the calculated values are weighted based on a ranking defined by relevance of the identified documents, such that substrings that occur in more relevant ones of the identified documents are assigned higher calculated values than substrings that occur in less relevant ones of the documents (see Robertson et al, column 14, lines 33-45 and see column 15, lines 20-25.)

As to claim 6, Robertson et al teaches a method of locating documents in response to a search query (see Abstract, and see column 18, lines 19-20, where a “search query” is read on “search operation”), the method comprising:

receiving the search query from a user (see column 6, lines 51-54);

generating a list of relevant documents based on search terms of the query (see column 13, lines 22-35);

identifying a subset of documents that are most relevant ones of the documents in the list of relevant documents (see column 14, lines 9-24);

generating a plurality of multiword substrings from the query (see column 4, line 63 through column 5, line 5, see column 8, lines 12-23) in which each of the substrings includes at least two words (see column 2, lines 52-56 and see column 13, lines 15-21); and

calculating, for each of the generated substrings, a value related to one or more documents in the subset of documents that contain the substrings (see column 14, lines 9-64, where “calculating a value related to one or more documents” is read on “calculates relevance information”, and see column 16, line 50 through column 17, line 8.)

Robertson et al does not teach: selecting semantic units from the generated multiword substrings based on the calculated values [although Robertson et al teaches “semantic units” as “a cluster of word numbers (see column 4, line 67 through column 5, line 5, and see column 18, lines 19-22), where each word number represents (is converted from) a word in a document (see column 2, lines 64-67)]; and he does not teach refining the generated list of relevant documents based on the selected semantic units.

Emens et al teaches a method for rating hypermedia for objectionable content (see Abstract), in which he teaches selecting semantic units from the generated multiword substrings based on the calculated values (see column 5, lines 28-48, and see column 6, line 54 through column 7, line 5, where “calculated values” is read on “ratings”); and refining the generated list of relevant documents based on the selected semantic units (see column 6, line 54 through column 7, line 25, and see column 8, lines 6-18.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Robertson et al to include selecting semantic units from the generated multiword substrings based on the calculated values; and refining the generated list of relevant documents based on the selected semantic units

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Robertson et al by the teachings of Emens et al, because including selecting semantic units from the generated multiword substrings based on the calculated values; and refining the generated list of relevant documents based on the selected semantic units, would enable the user to rank semantic units based on their relevance with the queried documents, and only retrieve (or only avoid) the documents (search results)



that have a higher relevance or occurrence with the selected semantic units. In Emens et al, the limitation of “refining the generated list of relevant documents” is taught in filtering out objectionable or unwanted content from the documents identified in the first search, before they are displayed to the user (see column 6, lines 57-66.) Other advantages of this limitation are explained in the Objections and Advantages and Summary sections of Emens et a (see column 2, lines 22-58.)

As to claims 7 and 31, Robertson et al as modified, teaches wherein the identified subset includes a predetermined number of the most relevant ones of the documents in the list of relevant documents (see Robertson et al, column 7, lines 3-17, where “identified subset” is read on “the set of documents that can be accessed through the search engine”, and see column 14, lines 33-45 and see column 15, lines 20-25.)

As to claim 11, Robertson et al teaches a system (see Abstract) comprising:  
a server (see “file server” in column 7, lines 11-12) connected to a network (see “Internet” in column 6, lines 47-51), the server receiving search queries from users via the network (see column 6, lines 51-54), the server including:

at least one processor (see “processing a search” in column 6, lines 59-65); and  
a memory operatively coupled to the processor (see column 7, lines 18-40), the memory storing program instructions that when executed by the processor, cause the processor to:

For the remaining steps of this claim, the applicant is directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 12, Robertson et al as modified, teaches wherein the processor refines the identified list of documents based on the selected semantic units (see Emens et al, column 6, line 54 through column 7, line 25, and see column 8, lines 6-18.)

As to claims 13 and 20, Robertson et al as modified, teaches wherein the system transmits the refined list of documents to the user (see Robertson et al, column 7, lines 61-63, and see Emens et al, column 6, lines 64-66.)

As to claim 14, Robertson et al as modified, teaches wherein the network is the Internet (see Robertson et al, column 6, lines 49-54 and see column 7, lines 8-12) and the corpus is a collection of web documents (see Robertson et al, column 6, lines 49-56, and see column 7, lines 8-12.)

As to claim 18, the applicant is directed to the remarks and discussions made in claims 1, 6, 11 and their respective dependent claims.

As to claim 19, Robertson et al as modified, teaches the server (see “file server” in Robertson et al, column 7, lines 11-12) further including:

a search engine (see Robertson et al, column 7, lines 8-10) configured to refine the list of documents based on the located semantic units (see Emens et al, column 6, line 54 through column 7, line 25, and see column 8, lines 6-18.)

As to claim 21, applicants are kindly directed to the remarks and discussions made in claims 1, 6, and 18 above.

As to claim 25, Robertson et al teaches a computer-readable medium storing instructions for causing at least one processor (see column 7, lines 18-31) to perform a method (for the remaining teachings of this claim, applicants are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claims 1 and 6 above.)

As to claim 30, applicant is directed to the remarks and discussions made in claims 1, 6, 11, 18, and 25 above.

As to claim 35, Robertson et al as modified, teaches wherein the computer-readable medium is a CD-ROM, floppy disk, tape, flash memory, system memory, hard drive, or data signal embodied in a carrier wave (see "disk I/O" in Robertson et al, Abstract, and see column 7, lines 18-23.)

As to claim 36, applicant is directed to the remarks and discussions made in claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 25, and 30 above.

As to claims 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41, Robertson et al as modified, teaches wherein the calculated values are weighted based on a ranking defined by relevance of the identified

Art Unit: 2165

documents, such that an occurrence of a substrings in a more relevant one of the documents is weighted more than an occurrence of the substrings in a less relevant one of the documents (see Robertson et al, column 7, line 57 through column 8, line 10, see column 14, lines 9-64, and see column 15, lines 45-51.)

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claim 2, 4, 9, 16, 21, 23, 26, 28, and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, provided that the Applicant fully overcomes the rejections made to the base claims under 35 U.S.C. 101 (above.)

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments presented in the Appeal Brief filed on 07-October-2005, with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered. The Examiner maintains his previous (prior art) rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as indicated in the previous as well as in the present Office Actions (with the exception of the claims indicated above as containing Allowable Subject Matter.) However, the Examiner is deferring his addressing of the Applicant's outstanding arguments until after the new rejections made under 35 U.S.C. 101 presented in this Office Action are overcome, and the claims are placed in a better condition for Appeal, at which time the Examiner will address all outstanding arguments in his Examiner's Answer to be submitted to the Board of Appeals and Interferences, if so desired by the Applicant.


***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4078. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin, can be reached at (571) 272-4146.

tm

October 30, 2006

  
Tony Mahmoudi